

Application No.: 10/676185

Case No.: 58976US002

Remarks

Claims 1 to 5 are pending. Claims 1 and 2 have been canceled herein. Claim 3 has been re-written in independent form, incorporating all of the limitations of claim 1. Claim 3 has also been amended to state that the web travels in the same direction before and after passing through the system. Support for this amendment may be found in Figure 1.

Claim 5 has been amended to clarify that the stationary cam is part of the slat repositioning device of each of the first and second slat rollers.

§ 112 Rejections

Claim 5 is rejected under 35 USC § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. The Examiner asserts that it is unclear if the "a stationary cam for moving the slats towards the first position" is another claimed feature in addition to the "a slat repositioning device for moving the slats towards the first position" of claim 1, or further defining the slat repositioning device.

The stationary cam in claim 5 further defines the slat-repositioning device. Applicants have amended claim 5 to clarify this point.

§ 102 Rejections

Claims 1 and 2 have been rejected under 35 USC § 102(b) as being anticipated by Scott (U.S. Patent No. 3,052,395) and Robertson et al. (U.S. Patent No. 3,095,131). Claims 1 and 2 have been cancelled, thus obviating the rejection over Scott and Robertson.

§ 103 Rejections

Claims 3 and 4 have been rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Scott in view of Planeta et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,013,212).

Scott is directed to a roller apparatus having longitudinally movable surface sections.

Planeta et al. is directed to method of controlling lateral wandering of a flattened tubular plastic film. Significantly, Planeta does not describe a system of slat rollers, or rollers having

Application No.: 10/676188

Case No.: 58976US002

longitudinally moving surface sections. The roller system shown in Planeta comprises a system of air rollers, not slat rollers as described in the amended claims of the present invention. Therefore, one skilled in the art would not be motivated to combine the rollers described in Scott with the rollers of Planeta. Even if combinable, the resultant combination would not result in the claims of the present invention as amended herein.

Claim 3 is directed to a system for inverting a moving a web comprising a pair of slat rollers, wherein the web starting in a first orientation is directed around the first slat roller and the second slat roller, and one or more intervening rollers, and emerges in a second orientation, while the direction of travel is maintained.

The combination of Scott and Planeta does not teach or suggest the invention as described by amended claim 3, or dependant claim 4.

The rejection of claims 3 and 4 under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Scott in view of Planeta et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,013,212) has been overcome and should be withdrawn.

Claims 3-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Robertson in view of Planeta et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,013,212).

Robertson is directed to a web guiding method and apparatus. While Robertson does teach a roller designed to change the direction of travel or to reverse the two faces of a web of material, Robertson does not teach or suggest how to reverse the two faces of the web while maintaining the same direction of travel as described in amended claims 3-5.

Planeta, as described above, is directed to a system of air rollers, and thus one skilled in the art would not be motivated to combine the teachings of Robertson and Planeta. Even if combinable, applicants assert that the resultant combination would not describe the current invention as disclosed in claims 3-5, as amended herein.

Applicants assert that the rejection of claims 3-5 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Robertson in view of Planeta et al. has been overcome and should be withdrawn.

In view of the above, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the application is requested.

Application No.: 10/676188

Case No.: 58976US002

Respectfully submitted,

January 18, 2005
Date

By: Pamela L. Stewart
Pamela L. Stewart, Reg. No.: 45,707
Telephone No.: (651) 733-2059

Office of Intellectual Property Counsel
3M Innovative Properties Company
Facsimile No.: 651-736-3833